UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/685,419	10/10/2000	Guojun Zhou	042390.P9908	5003

8791	7590	12/22/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER
AZAD, ABUL K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	16

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/685,419		ZHOU, GUOJUN
	Examiner		Art Unit
	ABUL K. AZAD		2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 October 2003_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,3,5,7-13,15,17,19-27,29,30,32,33 and 35-38_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,3,5,7-13,15,17,19-27,29,30,32,33 and 35-38_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 11-03)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No. 16

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is in response to the communication filed on October 7, 2003.

2.   Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 -13, 15, 17, 19-27, 29-30, 32-33 and 35-38 are pending in this

action. Claims 1, 13, 25 and 33 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 6, 14, 16, 18, 28, 31

and 34 have been canceled. Claims 36, 37, and 38 have been newly added.

3.   The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 5, 7 -13, 15, 17, 19-27, 29-

30, 32-33, 35-38 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

For examiner's response to the applicant arguments or comments, see the detailed

discussion in the Response to the Arguments section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19-22, 25-27, 29-30, 33 and 35-38 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junqua et al. (US

6,324,512) in view of Cohen et al. (EP 1 014 277) further in view of Nosohara (EP 0 838

765).

As per claim 1, Junqua teaches, "a method of interfacing to a system comprising"

"receiving speech input data from a user" (col. 2, lines 52-61, user's spoken

instruction);

"converting the speech input data into a first text in the identified language by recognizing the user's speech in the speech input data based at least in part on the language identifier" (col. 2, lines 52-61, reads on "the user spoken instructions are converted into text by speech recognizer");

"parsing the first text to extract keywords" (col. 2, lines 52-61, parser);

"using the keywords as a command to an application" (col. 3, lines 9-17, reads on "if the use's instruction is sufficiently refined to constitute a command, the unified access controller sends a control command to the digital tuner");

"receiving results to the command" (col. 3, lines 1-31, reply as the results);

"converting the results into a second text in a natural languages format according to the identified language spoken by the user; and rendering the second text for perception by the user" (col. 3, lines 1-17, reads on "the unified access controller then sends a text message (second text) to the speech synthesizer, which, in turn, synthesizes a spoken reply").

Junqua does not teach, "identifying a language spoken by the user from the speech input data". However, Cohen teaches, "identifying a language spoken by the user from the speech input data" (col. 3, line 56 to col.8, language recognition/identification). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to identify a language spoken by user as teaches by Cohen so that a language identification is achieved for enhancing the speech recognition process from a plurality of languages.

Junqua and Cohen do not teaches: "automatically translating the keywords into a plurality of automatically selected languages other than the identified language and using the translated keywords a search query to a search engine."

However, Nosohara teaches, "translating the keywords into a plurality of automatically selected languages other than the identified language and using the translated keywords a search query to a search engine, wherein the results comprises search results from the search engine operating on the search query" (col. 3, lines 6-22, reads on "translate the keyword input by searcher into another language used in the document to be searched"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Nosohara's teaching so that optimum search result is obtained from a verity of database using translation of the keyword.

As per claim 3, Junqua teaches, "rendering comprises converting the second text into speech and rendering the speech to the user" (col. 3, lines 1-31, reads on "the unified access controller then sends a text message (second text) to the speech synthesizer, which, in turn, synthesizes a spoken reply").

As per claims 13, 15 and 25-26, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 3.

As per claim 5, Junqua teaches, "using the keywords as a search query to at least one search engine, wherein the results comprises search results from the at least one search engine operating on the search query" (col. 3, lines 1-31).

As per claims 7 and 8, Junqua and Cohen do not teaches: "automatically translating the keywords into a plurality of automatically selected languages other than

the identified language and using the translated keywords a search query to a search engine, wherein the results comprises search results from the search engine operating on the search query."

"automatically translating search result in languages other than the identified language to the identified language".

However, Nosohara teaches, "translating the keywords into a plurality of automatically selected languages other than the identified language and using the translated keywords a search query to a search engine, wherein the results comprises search results from the search engine operating on the search query" (col. 3, lines 6-22, reads on "translate the keyword input by searcher into another language used in the document to be searched");

"translating search result in languages other than the identified language to the identified language" (col. 3, lines 6-22; translate the documents stored in the search result storage means to the designated language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Nosohara's teaching so that optimum search result is obtained from a verity of database using translation of the keyword.

As per claims 19, 20 and 27, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 7 and 8 above.

As per claim 9, Junqua teaches, "the application comprises a web browser" (web browser is inherent because here uses TCP/IP protocols for Internet access, see at col. 3, lines 41-48).

As per claim 10, Junqua teaches, "wherein the web browser interfaces with a search engine and command comprises a search query" (col. 3, lines 1-48, queries).

As per claims 17, 21-22 and 29-30, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 5 and 9-10.

As per claim 12 and 24, Junqua teaches, "wherein the speech comprises conversational speech" (col. 4, lines 35-51, here uses a natural language as conversational speech).

As per claim 36, 37 and 38, Junqua teaches, "automatically summarizing the results prior to converting the results to the second text" (col. 3, lines 18-34, reads on "if the requested program is found, a dialog manager formulates a response (summarized). . . sends a text message (results to second text)").

As per claim 33 and 35, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 36.

6.   Claims 11, 23 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junqua in view of Cohen as applied to claims 9, 21 and 29 above, and further in view of Well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

As per claims 11, 23, and 32, Junqua and Cohen do not teaches, "the web browser interfaces with a shopping web site and command comprises at least one of purchase order and a request for product information". Official Notice is taken on shopping web browser. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a shopping web browser so that it would be convenient to use shopping web browser using speech command.

Response to Arguments

7.   The applicant argues: "Nosohara teaches or suggest nothing about the limitation

. . . <u>automatic destination language selection and translation</u>".

The examiner has interpreted the claims in light of the specification. The

applicant discloses in the specification about language selection and translation at page

8, lines 17-20 as "the keywords may be translated by machine translation module 28

into a plurality of supported languages" also at page 11, lines 6-7 as "at block 110, the

keywords may be translated into a plurality of languages". The applicant does not

particularly define how he automatically selected a plurality of languages. Here,

Nosohara teaches, at col. 5, lines 14-16, "the language used to define the search

conditions is translated into other languages that are used in the databases to be

searched". Here, from Nosohar's statement, it is clear that according to search condition

the languages are automatically selected and automatically translated to the languages

other then the inputted languages. Therefore, the claimed limitation in light of

specification is red from the reference.

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Abul K. Azad** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-**

3838.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Richemond Dorvil,** can be reached at **(703) 305-9645.**

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

> **Commissioner for Patents**
>
> **P.O. Box 1450**
>
> **Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Or faxed to:

> **(703) 872-9314**
>
> (For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")
>
> Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington,
>
> VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should

be directed to the Technology Center's Customer Service Office whose telephone

number is **(703) 306-0377.**

Abul K. Azad

December 17, 2003

RICHEMOND DORVIL

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER